

Adam D. Helfer

Angular momentum of isolated systems

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Penrose’s twistorial approach to the definition of angular momentum at null infinity is developed so that angular momenta at different cuts can be meaningfully compared. This is done by showing that the twistor spaces associated with different cuts of $\mathcal{I}^+$ can be identified as manifolds (but not as vector spaces). The result is a well-defined, Bondi–Metzner–Sachs-invariant notion of angular momentum in a radiating space–time; the difficulties and ambiguities previously encountered are attached to attempts to express this in special-relativistic terms, and in particular to attempts to identify a single Minkowski space of origins. Unlike the special-relativistic case, the angular momentum cannot be represented by a purely $j = 1$ quantity M_{ab} , but has higher- j contributions as well. Applying standard kinematic prescriptions, these higher- j contributions are shown to correspond precisely to the shear. Thus it appears that shear and angular momentum should be regarded as different aspects of a single unified concept.

Keywords angular momentum · gravitational radiation · asymptotic structure of space–time

1 Introduction

Energy–momentum and angular momentum (throughout this paper, ‘angular momentum’ will refer to the relativistic quantity) are of prime importance physically. Practically, they are key conserved quantities in the analysis of specific systems; theoretically, they are of fundamental significance, both classically and in quantum physics.

Department of Mathematics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, U.S.A.
Tel.: 573-882-7283
Fax: 573-882-1869
E-Mail: adam@math.missouri.edu

Yet while these quantities are well-understood in special relativity, their extension to general-relativistic situations is still in development. This is because the *foundation* of the usual analysis — the existence of the Poincaré isometry group, generating the conserved quantities — is absent: a general space-time will have no isometries. We must expect, therefore, that in generalizing momentum and angular momentum to curved space-time, we will be forced to give up at least some of their familiar features, and perhaps to reassess what their roots are.

For systems which are isolated in the sense of Bondi and Sachs, that is, isolated in that one has a well-defined concept of what it means for radiation to escape from them, the Bondi–Sachs energy–momentum is now accepted as correct. The success here has been closely connected with the existence of a satisfactory four-dimensional group of asymptotic translations. For the angular momentum of radiating systems, however, there have remained problems. The asymptotic symmetry group, the Bondi–Metzner–Sachs (BMS) group, (even though it has the canonical four-dimensional translation subgroup) does *not* have any physically preferred Poincaré subgroup, but rather an infinite-dimensional family of them, apparently on equal footings. This issue often surfaces as an ambiguity in defining a satisfactory space of origins with respect to which angular momentum is to be measured. One can in fact make a good argument that it is *impossible* to identify a preferred physically natural space of such origins.¹

What properties should we look for in a definition of angular momentum for isolated general-relativistic systems? Certainly the definition itself should be natural, which is to say it should respect the BMS symmetries. (It need not be made in terms of the BMS generators, however.) And of course it should be a plausible extension of the special-relativistic definition (although perhaps from an unorthodox perspective). Finally, I think it is essential that angular momenta at different cuts be unambiguously comparable, for that is what is necessary for a concept of conservation, and a useful measure of exchange between systems.

In this paper, I shall show that it is possible to achieve these goals by making a definition of angular momentum directly on a twistor space. The twistor space, and the measure of angular momentum on it, have natural, invariant, and unproblematic existences, which extend the definitions in special-relativistic twistor theory. (It is the attempts to pass from this twistor space to various candidate ‘spaces of origins’ which introduce difficulties and ambiguities.) But the most important feature of the twistor space is that it is *universal*, in that it depends only on those aspects of the asymptotic structure which are common to all Bondi–Sachs systems.

The construction is a development of Penrose’s quasilocal twistors applied at future null infinity $\mathcal{J}^+$ [5,6]. Penrose showed that for each cut $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{J}^+$, there exists a natural twistor space $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ with familiar special-relativistic proper-

¹ Suppose the gravitational radiation is confined to several finite intervals of retarded time. Then in the intervening, quiescent, intervals, one has candidate spaces of origins, but there are in general gauge mismatches (distortions by ‘supertranslations’) between these quiescent periods which prevent the identification of their different spaces of origins in any natural and consistent way. Cf. [3,1,6].

ties, most notably being a four-complex-dimensional vector space. What I shall show here is that there is a natural identification of all these twistor spaces as real manifolds. This means that we may say we have single twistor space $\mathcal{T}$ with many different possible complex-linear structures, one for each cut. The space $\mathcal{T}$ retains enough structure that there is a meaningful twistorial definition of angular momentum on it. As the origin-dependence of angular momentum becomes, in twistor terms, a dependence on the choice of twistor, it is the *existence* of a well-defined twistor space which is the solution of the problem.

While the twistor space $\mathcal{T}$ has no canonical linear structure, it does canonically have a fibre-bundle structure, a bundle of affine complex planes over a two-complex dimensional vector space. This base space may be identified with asymptotic spin space $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$. The elements of $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$ can be used to specify the components of the angular momentum in question, and the choice of point in the fibre corresponds to a choice of origin.

This means that if we think of measuring the angular momentum by specifying both a component and an origin, then *fixing the component* one gets a sensible definition (with a conventional origin-dependence); it is the behavior of this construction as the component varies (in $\mathcal{T}$, as we pass from one fibre to another) which is complicated. We shall see that the components of the angular momentum no longer constitute a pure $j = 1$ quantity M_{ab} , but a more complicated object with higher- j contributions.

For instance, we will derive this formula for the spin:

$$\text{spin}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = s_{\mathbf{v}}^a \hat{\mathbf{r}}_a + M \Im \lambda(\hat{\mathbf{r}}), \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ is a unit spatial vector representing the direction in which the spin is to be measured, the vectorial part of the spin is $s_{\mathbf{v}}^a$, the Bondi–Sachs mass is M , and $\Im \lambda$ is an angular potential for the magnetic part of the Bondi shear, with components for $j \geq 2$. In other words, the spin can be measured in different directions, but these measurements do not ‘integrate up’ to give simply a spin-vector; they give a more complicated angular dependence. Note that here (as throughout this paper) the quantity j refers, not to the values that angular momentum takes, but to the functional dependence of the angular momentum on direction.

The formula (1) is interesting for a number of reasons. First, it gives an explicit and transparent role to the magnetic part of the shear. (Investigations have repeatedly turned up a sensitivity of angular-momentum constructions to the magnetic shear, but the precise role has been difficult to pin down.) Second, the remarkable simplicity of this formula can fairly be taken as evidence in favor of the present approach. Third, this result is intuitively plausible, because in special relativity it is well-known that $M^{-1}s_{\mathbf{v}}^a$ can be interpreted as a displacement of the center of mass into the complex and in twistor theory $\Im \lambda$ has a similar interpretation as a displacement of the cut into the complex.

One can also apply standard kinematic formulas to identify the center of mass, and it has a non-vectorial part which may be identified with the angular potential $\Re \lambda$ for the electric part of the Bondi shear. Thus it is the Bondi shear which controls the non-Poincaré character of the angular

momentum, the electric and magnetic parts of the shear contributing non-Poincaré behavior to the center-of-mass and spin, respectively.

These results suggest that the shear forms a sort of angular momentum, essentially the $j \geq 2$ parts of the angular momentum, and that, in passing from special to general relativity, the mixing of gravitational radiation and matter mixes ‘ordinary’ ($j = 1$) angular momentum and radiative modes of the field, so that the ‘correct’ understanding of angular momentum embraces the two concepts.

The most important consequence of the close identification of angular momentum with shear is that gravitational radiation may carry off angular momentum (including $j = 1$ parts) as a *first-order* effect (in the Bondi news), whereas energy–momentum is radiated as a second-order effect. Thus the radiation of angular momentum may be a more important effect for, and a more significant constraint on, many systems than is the radiation of energy–momentum.

Still, the effects are not generally expected to be large except in highly relativistic circumstances (or perhaps cumulatively over long times or large volumes). They are typically characterized by the length scale set by the Bondi shear — more precisely, by the magnetic part of the shear, and by changes in the electric part of the shear. This scale is typically of order $\sim (GM/c^2)(v/c)^n$, where M is a characteristic mass and v a characteristic velocity and $n \geq 2$.² Even for relativistic velocities, this is only of order the Schwarzschild radius of the mass. Thus while it is to be hoped that eventually astrophysical measurements will be refined enough to warrant the use of general-relativistically-corrected angular momenta, the main interest at present is theoretical.

One would also expect the ideas here to give quantum-gravitational corrections to angular momentum and spin. These effects do not appear to be significant for individual microscopic systems, since the corrections are typically of the order $(E/E_{\text{Pl}})^2 \hbar$, where E is the energy of the system and E_{Pl} is the Planck energy. However, the development of a quantum theory of spin incorporating the ideas here could very well have implications for the final stages of black hole evaporation, because it could constrain the possible transitions.

1.1 Real twistors, magnetic shear and origins

This subsection deals with the reality structure on twistor space. While this will figure essentially in the paper, the reader not specially interested in twistor theory can safely skip this part, referring back to it later if necessary.

While the ideas sketched above present an accurate outline of the main points in conventional space–time terms, they do leave out one crucial element of the twistor structure, its reality properties. It turns out that these

² This is of course a very crude statement and is only useful at the coarsest level. Given any specific system, one needs to think about what the appropriate choices are for M and v . For example, in cases where there is a change in electric shear the correct characteristic velocity v may be something like the square root of the change in the squared velocity of a component of the system.

are closely tied to the magnetic part of the shear, to the failure of a model Minkowski space of origins to exist, and to differences between the structures of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$.

In order to explain this, a quick outline of the special-relativistic case is in order. There, twistor space has a Hermitian form of signature $++--$, and the twistors Z^α which are null ($Z^\alpha \bar{Z}_\alpha = 0$) with respect to it are called ‘real’. The points in Minkowski space may be identified with the totally real (that is, totally null) complex two-planes, and thus real twistors are involved centrally in definition of origins for angular momentum.

In the general-relativistic case, we shall find that there is a natural definition of a quantity Φ on $\mathcal{T}$ analogous to the form $Z^\alpha \bar{Z}_\alpha$ on special-relativistic twistor space, and one can define real twistors with respect to Φ and thus develop a theory of angular momentum and spin. Of course, since $\mathcal{T}$ has no preferred linear structure, one cannot properly say that Φ is a (squared) norm. However, the failure is not just a semantic nicety.

Given any cut $\mathcal{S}$, there is a natural identification of the twistor space $\mathcal{T}$ with Penrose’s $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$, which could then be used to give $\mathcal{T}$ an $\mathcal{S}$ -dependent complex-linear structure. However, in general the function Φ does *not* respect that linear structure — that is, in general, the function Φ is *not* the restriction of any Hermitian form on $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$, but is more strongly nonlinear. This means that in general one *cannot* find totally Φ -real two-planes in $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$, and thus one cannot reconstruct from $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ a Minkowski space of origins. In fact, we shall see that the condition for Φ to arise from a Hermitian form on $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ is *precisely* that $\mathcal{S}$ should have no magnetic shear. Thus it is precisely the presence of magnetic shear on $\mathcal{S}$ which prevents the identification of a Minkowski space of origins from $\mathcal{T}$.

1.2 Organization

The plan of the paper is this. The next section reviews twistorial kinematics and Penrose’s construction. Section 3 is the heart of the paper; it explains how the twistor spaces at different cuts may be identified, and what the structure of the resulting nonlinear twistor space is. Section 4 explains how this space may be used to compute angular momentum. There the formulas for the spin and center of mass are deduced, as well as a flux law. Section 5 explains how the present (non-Poincaré) angular momentum is connected to the familiar (Poincaré) special-relativistic one, by discussing the case of linearized gravity. An account of the number of constants of motion produced by this framework, and the relation of the relation of angular momentum to gravitational degrees of freedom, is given in section 6. The final section recapitulates the paper’s main conclusions.

Notation, conventions and background. The notation and conventions are those of Penrose and Rindler [6], in which also all concepts not explained here can be found. This paper assumes a familiarity with two-spinors and spin-coefficients, as well as Penrose’s conformal treatment of $\mathcal{I}^+$. All computations at $\mathcal{I}^+$ are in terms of the conformally rescaled quantities. Factors of G are given explicitly, but some factors of c are suppressed.

In this paper, we work at future null infinity $\mathcal{J}^+$. However, parallel results, applying to incoming radiation, could be obtained at past null infinity $\mathcal{J}^-$, by reversing the sense of time.

For a review of the problems of defining angular momentum and related issues, see the article by Szabados [7]. Another sort of curved twistor space was introduced by Penrose [4]; this was essentially equivalent to the $\mathcal{H}$ -space of Newman [2], which had roots in work on angular momentum as well.

2 Twistorial kinematics and Penrose's construction

This section summarizes the main points of twistor theory which will be used. Section 2.1 can be safely skipped by those familiar with twistor theory. The same is true for most of section 2.3, although the final two paragraphs do contain some new comments about the case of cuts with magnetic shear. Section 2.2 should be read, because the material is presented from a slightly unconventional vantage adapted to later arguments.

2.1 Twistors in Minkowski space

In Minkowski space, twistors can be regarded as solutions of the *twistor equation*

$$\nabla^{A'}(A\omega^B) = 0. \quad (2)$$

It can be shown that there is a four-complex-dimensional family $\mathbb{T}$ of solutions, each of the form $\omega^A(x) = {}_0\omega^A - ix^{AA'}\pi_{A'}$, where ${}_0\omega^A$ and $\pi_{A'}$ are fixed spinors. A twistor, when it is thought of as an element of this space (that is, when its character as a spinor field is not emphasized) is generally denoted by Z^α , and one sometimes writes $Z^\alpha = ({}_0\omega^A, \pi_{A'})$. Under Lorentz motions, the spinors transform conventionally. Under a translation $x^a \mapsto x^a + k^a$, we have $\omega^A(x+k) = {}_0\omega^A - i(x^{AA'} + k^{AA'})\pi_{A'}$, so $({}_0\omega^A, \pi_{A'}) \mapsto ({}_0\omega^A - ik^{AA'}\pi_{A'}, \pi_{A'})$. This means that the projection $Z^\alpha \mapsto \pi_{A'}$ is Poincaré-covariant. Complementarily, the twistors with $\pi_{A'} = 0$ have ${}_0\omega^A$ translation-invariant and are said to lie at infinity.

The following twistorial structures are also important. There is an alternating twistor $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ and a norm $Z^\alpha\bar{Z}_\alpha = {}_0\omega^A\bar{\pi}_A + \overline{{}_0\omega^A}\pi_{A'}$. (These are both conformally invariant.) A twistor with $Z^\alpha\bar{Z}_\alpha = 0$ is said to be *null* or *real*. Additionally, there is a (Poincaré-invariant) *infinity twistor*

$$I^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^{AB} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

For any skew bitwistor $X^{\alpha\beta} = -X^{\beta\alpha}$, its dual is defined by $X_{\alpha\beta} = (1/2)\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}X^{\gamma\delta}$. A skew bitwistor is real iff $X_{\alpha\beta} = \bar{X}_{\alpha\beta}$. In particular, the infinity twistor is real.

Any point x in Minkowski space determines a complex two-plane of twistors, those for which $\omega^A(x) = 0$, and all twistors on this plane are null.

Conversely, any complex two-plane in $\mathbb{T}$ all of whose elements are null determines a point in Minkowski space (or a point at infinity). The points at infinity in Minkowski space are precisely those whose twistor planes include at least one twistor at infinity. Correspondingly, a null twistor vanishes exactly on a null geodesic in Minkowski space, along which its spinor $\pi_{A'}$ is tangent (or the twistor corresponds to a limit at infinity of this situation).

2.2 Kinematics twistorially

If P_a and $M_{ab} = \mu_{A'B'}\epsilon_{AB} + \bar{\mu}_{AB}\epsilon_{A'B'}$ are the momentum and angular momentum of a special-relativistic system, they define a *kinematic twistor*, whose spinor components are given by

$$A_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P_A{}^{B'} \\ P^{A'}{}_B & 2i\mu^{A'B'} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

That is, the angular momentum has exactly the correct origin-dependence for $A_{\alpha\beta}$ to transform as a (dual bi-)twistor.

For any twistor Z^α , then, the combination

$$A(Z) = A_{\alpha\beta}Z^\alpha Z^\beta = 2i\mu^{A'B'}\pi_{A'}\pi_{B'} + 2P_A{}^{A'}\omega^A\pi_{A'} \quad (5)$$

is invariant, that is, the origin-dependences of $\mu^{A'B'}$ and ω^A cancel out. In fact, this quantity is simply 2i times the $\pi_{A'}$ -component (or, more properly, the $\pi_{A'}\pi_{B'}$ -component) of the spinor form of the relativistic angular momentum at any point x where $\omega^A(x) = 0$. We may thus regard $A(Z)$ as measuring the angular momentum, by choosing $Z^\alpha = (ix^{AA'}\pi_{A'}, \pi_{A'})$, where x is the point at which to evaluate the angular momentum and $\pi_{A'}$ determines the component in question. (By polarization, or equivalently, by differentiating with respect to $\pi_{A'}$, one can get all components of the angular momentum this way.) Thus a knowledge of $A(Z)$ on null twistors is equivalent to a knowledge of angular momentum, the choice of twistor coding both the origin with respect to which one is measuring and the component measured.

We shall have also to consider the polarized form $A(Z, \acute{Z}) = A_{\alpha\beta}Z^\alpha \acute{Z}^\beta$. For us, it is most natural to think of this as a sort of two-point function on twistor space. It is possible, of course, to interpret this in more conventional special-relativistic terms; a brief calculation shows that

$$A(Z, \acute{Z}) = 2i\mu^{A'B'}(x_{\text{av}})\pi_{A'}\acute{\pi}_{B'} - (i/2)P_ax_{\text{diff}}^a\pi_{B'}\acute{\pi}^{B'}, \quad (6)$$

where $x_{\text{av}}^a = (1/2)(x^a + \acute{x}^a)$ and $x_{\text{diff}}^a = x^a - \acute{x}^a$. In this formula, the points x^a , $\acute{x}^a$ are arbitrary points on the twistors Z , $\acute{Z}$. They are thus subject to the freedoms $x^a \rightarrow x^a + \xi\bar{\pi}^A\pi^{A'}$, $\acute{x}^a \rightarrow \acute{x}^a + \acute{\xi}\acute{\bar{\pi}}^A\acute{\pi}^{A'}$. There is a one-parameter family of these for which the factor $P_ax_{\text{diff}}^a = 0$, and it defines a timelike world-line of values of x_{av}^a with tangent P^a . Thus one can interpret $A(Z, \acute{Z})$ as a component of the angular momentum at any point on this world-line. However, this interpretation will not be available in the generic

general-relativistic setting, because we will not really have a model Minkowski space in which to envision world-lines.

We are led to think of the angular momentum as actually being the functions $A(Z)$, $A(Z, \dot{Z})$ on twistor space. Thus we think of evaluating the angular momentum, not by taking particular components at a particular space-time point, but by evaluating $A(Z)$, $A(Z, \dot{Z})$ on twistor space (with a distinguished role played by the values at twistors with $Z^\alpha \bar{Z}_\alpha = 0$). This will be our point of view in what follows. This twistorial description of angular momentum remains valid even when it is difficult to define a space of origins. Since each null twistor corresponds to a null geodesic with tangent spinor, the function $A(Z)$ is just the component of the angular momentum determined by $\pi_{A'}$ evaluated along the geodesic. The function $A(Z, \dot{Z})$ can be also be interpreted as a sum of the angular momentum at the average of any two points on the geodesics plus a correction due to the difference between the two points (cf. the previous paragraph), but it is really most natural to think of it as simply a two-point function on the space of real twistors.

Twistor expressions for the spin are a little involved. There are several ways of doing it; we give one which will be well-suited to later generalization. Suppose that Z^α , $\dot{Z}^\alpha$ are both real and also satisfy $A_{\alpha\beta} Z^\alpha Z^\beta = 0$, $A_{\alpha\beta} \dot{Z}^\alpha \dot{Z}^\beta = 0$. Then by direct calculation, one can verify the following identity:

$$\Re A_{\alpha\beta} Z^\alpha \dot{Z}^\beta / I_{\gamma\delta} Z^\gamma \dot{Z}^\delta = (2P^{AA'} \bar{\pi}_A \pi_{A'} P^{BB'} \bar{\pi}_B \dot{\pi}_{B'})^{-1} \cdot \\ \left(S^{AA'} \bar{\pi}_A \pi_{A'} P^{BB'} \bar{\pi}_B \dot{\pi}_{B'} - S^{AA'} \dot{\pi}_A \dot{\pi}_{A'} P^{BB'} \bar{\pi}_B \pi_{B'} \right), \quad (7)$$

where $S_a = (1/2)\epsilon_{abcd} P^b M^{cd}$ is the Pauli–Lubański spin covector. This identity allows one to recover the spin in terms of real twistors. (It is not quite obvious that given $\pi_{A'}$ and $\dot{\pi}_{A'}$ there do exist real twistors Z^α , $\dot{Z}^\alpha$ with $A_{\alpha\beta} Z^\alpha Z^\beta = A_{\alpha\beta} \dot{Z}^\alpha \dot{Z}^\beta = 0$, but this can be deduced from (5).)

2.3 Twistors on cuts of $\mathcal{J}^+$

In a curved space-time, the twistor equation is in general over-determined and has only the trivial solution. However, in favorable circumstances one can obtain twistor spaces by considering just certain components of the equation. If $\mathcal{S}$ is a cut of $\mathcal{J}^+$, the components of the twistor equation involving only derivatives tangent to $\mathcal{J}^+$ are

$$\delta' \omega^0 = 0, \quad \delta \omega^1 = \sigma \omega^0, \quad (8)$$

where we use the standard spin-coefficient formalism for the geometry expressed in conformally rescaled terms (cf. [6]). This system of equations defines a four-complex-dimensional vector space $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$, which turns out to have an infinity twistor and alternating twistor obeying the same algebra as those in Minkowski space.

The kinematic twistor, deduced by correspondence with linear theory, is

$$A(Z) = A_{\alpha\beta} Z^\alpha Z^\beta = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \{ \psi_1 (\omega^0)^2 + 2(\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}}) \omega^0 \omega^1 \} dS, \quad (9)$$

where the overdot represents differentiation with respect to u and an integration by parts has been used to simplify the expression somewhat.

To complete the treatment of kinematics, one also needs a norm (and to verify that the other quantities have the appropriate reality properties with respect to it). The natural thing to do is to express $Z^\alpha \bar{Z}_\alpha$ in terms of the spinor fields ω^0, ω^1 . This can be done, but one finds that the resulting expression, while constant in Minkowski space, or on a cut with purely electric shear, is not constant if the shear has a magnetic component. (Recall that the shear σ , being a spin-weight two quantity, can always be expressed as $\sigma = \bar{\partial}^2 \lambda$ for an ordinary function λ . The electric and magnetic parts of the shear are $\sigma_{\text{el}} = \bar{\partial}^2 \Re \lambda$ and $\sigma_{\text{mag}} = \bar{\partial}^2 i \Im \lambda$.) Penrose suggested, with some reservations, averaging over the cut with respect to the metric defined by the Bondi–Sachs energy–momentum. Then one does get the proper special-relativistic twistor algebra.

There are two concerns about this norm (in the cases where there is a magnetic component to the shear) which should be raised here. The first is its strong cut-dependence, which makes it hard to understand how to compare angular momenta at different retarded times. The second is that, were one to adopt it, one would have to regard the physical space–time as displaced into the complex relative to the reality structure on the twistor space [6], and this would mean (for example) that a massless test particle on a light ray, which by local measurements had zero helicity, would have to be ascribed a non-zero helicity according to the twistorial definition.

3 Identifying the twistor spaces

I show here how the twistor spaces at the different cuts of $\mathcal{J}^+$ may be identified. While the ideas are not difficult, it is perhaps well to begin by cautioning against a possible preconception. On each cut the twistors are defined as spinor fields satisfying certain equations, so one might be tempted to think that the twistors could be realized as spinor fields over all of $\mathcal{J}^+$, which simply restrict to the correct values on any cut. However, the twistors have a more delocalized existence, taking well-defined values as spinor fields only when an entire cut (and not simply a point on the cut) is specified.

3.1 The field ω^0

The components ω^0, ω^1 , and the two components of the two-surface twistor equation, are not on the same footing as far as the delocalization just discussed goes. It turns out that the space of ω^0 s satisfying $\bar{\partial}' \omega^0 = 0$ on any cut *does* have a well-defined existence as a field on all of $\mathcal{J}^+$. This feature is a well-known part of Penrose's construction, the space of such ω^0 being identified

with $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$, the space of primed dual twistors ‘at infinity’, and the projection $(\omega^0, \omega^1) \mapsto \omega^0$ providing a fibration $\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{A'}$ of the twistor space on a given cut to this space. The ω^0 spinors in this case satisfy $\mathbf{P}'\omega^0 = 0$ (as well as $\bar{\partial}'\omega^0 = 0$), which can be thought of as providing a propagation equation from one cut to another. These two equations may be expressed jointly as $\iota_A \iota_B \nabla^{AA'} \omega^B = 0$, which makes the cut-independence of the system clear, since ι^A is (apart from scaling) independent of the Bondi system.

There will be a consequence of this which will figure centrally in what follows. This is that for any admissible ω^0 field which is not identically zero, there is a unique generator $\gamma(\omega^0)$ of $\mathcal{I}^+$ on which ω^0 vanishes. (This is a well-known consequence of the equation $\bar{\partial}'\omega^0 = 0$, given that ω^0 has spin-weight $-1/2$, together with the equation $\mathbf{P}'\omega^0 = 0$, which transports ω^0 up the generators.) The generator on which ω^0 vanishes is also independent of the choice of Bondi system, as can be seen by writing the vanishing equation in the form $\omega^A \iota_A = 0$.

3.2 The field ω^1

We have seen that, for each twistor, the field ω^0 has a well-defined cut-independent existence. However, the situation for ω^1 is more complicated.

In order to treat twistors without having in each instance to take up their global behavior over a cut, we take advantage of the fact that each twistor can be specified, at any point of the cut, by suitable data. These data are most commonly taken to be the values $(\omega^0, \omega^1, \pi_{0'}, \pi_{1'})$, where $\pi_{0'} = i\bar{\partial}'\omega^1 - i\rho\omega^0$, $\pi_{1'} = i\bar{\partial}\omega^0$.³ We may thus, in order to ask how to transport a twistor from one cut to another, simply ask how to identify its data at one point on the first cut with data at another point on the second cut.

Our prescription will essentially consist of transporting the twistor along the generator $\gamma(\omega^0)$ on which ω^0 vanishes; this generator must intersect each cut in a single point. (The case of identically vanishing ω^0 will be seen later to be determined by continuity, and also to agree with Penrose’s definition of the spin space $\mathbb{S}^A$.)

In order to determine the correct transport equations, we recall the formula for the *local twistor connection*:

$$D_{BB'}(\omega^A, \pi_{A'}) = (\nabla_{BB'}\omega^A + i\epsilon_B{}^A \pi_{B'}, \nabla_{BB'}\pi_{A'} + iP_{ABA'B'}\omega^A), \quad (10)$$

where $P_{ab} = \Phi_{ab} - \Lambda g_{ab} = (1/12)Rg_{ab} - (1/2)R_{ab}$. The equation $D_{BB'}(\omega^A, \pi_{A'}) = 0$ has, in a conformally flat space-time, locally a four-complex-dimensional family of solutions which comprise twistor space. At $\mathcal{I}^+$ when gravitational radiation is present, this equation is over-determined and does not have a full four-dimensional family of solutions. However, we shall *only* use components where the derivative is tangent to a generator of $\mathcal{I}^+$ and we shall *only* enforce it on the single generator $\gamma(\omega^0)$. Thus we have a system of ordinary differential equations on a line, and there are no integrability restrictions.

³ For convenience, we choose $\rho' = 0$.

The components of (10) in question are

$$n^b D_b (\omega^A, \pi_{A'}) = 0 \text{ on } \gamma(\omega^0). \quad (11)$$

In this form, they are manifestly independent of the choice of Bondi system. In spin-coefficient notation, they become

$$\mathbf{P}'\omega^0 = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}'\omega^1 = \bar{\partial}\omega^0, \quad \mathbf{P}'\bar{\partial}'\omega^1 = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}'\bar{\partial}\omega^0 = 0 \text{ on } \gamma(\omega^0). \quad (12)$$

We shall use these now to derive an explicit transformation for twistors from one cut to another. For simplicity, we take these here to be two $u = \text{const}$ cuts of the same Bondi system, although this is not necessary.

The twistors on the cuts may be conveniently given. We let λ be any function satisfying $\bar{\partial}^2 \lambda = \sigma$; then the ω^1 fields on the cut have the form

$$\omega^1 = \omega^0 \bar{\partial} \lambda - \lambda \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \xi, \quad (13)$$

where ξ is any solution to $\bar{\partial} \xi = 0$. (This observation is due to K. P. Tod.) The space of such ξ is spanned by $\bar{\partial}\omega^0$ and $\bar{\omega}^{0'}$, and so

$$\omega^1 = \omega^0 \bar{\partial} \lambda - \lambda \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \alpha \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \beta \bar{\omega}^{0'}, \quad (14)$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(u)$ and $\beta = \beta(u)$ are to be determined. Substituting (14) into (12) and integrating, we find

$$\alpha = u - u_0 + \lambda(u, \gamma) - \lambda(u_0, \gamma) + \alpha_0 \quad (15)$$

$$\beta = \frac{\bar{\partial}\omega^0(\gamma)}{\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'}(\gamma)} (\bar{\partial}'\lambda(u, \gamma) - \bar{\partial}'\lambda(u_0, \gamma)) + \beta_0, \quad (16)$$

where $\alpha(u_0) = \alpha_0$, $\beta(u_0) = \beta_0$, and we have abused notation slightly by writing the generator γ as the argument of functions (rather than the angular variables determining γ).

These formulas allow us to identify the twistor spaces $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ at different cuts, so we may say that we have a single twistor space $\mathcal{T}$. For any fixed u_0 , we may view $\alpha(u_0)$ and $\beta(u_0)$ (together with a coordinatization of the ω^0 fields) as providing coordinates on $\mathcal{T}$ (and identifying it with $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S}_0)$, where $\mathcal{S}_0$ corresponds to u_0). As u varies, the transport formulas give us transition functions to other coordinate systems $(\alpha(u), \beta(u))$. The formulas are generally nonlinear, because of the nonlinear dependence of the terms on γ , the generator on which ω^0 vanishes.

So far we have excluded the case of twistors with identically vanishing ω^0 . To obtain coordinate charts including such twistors we choose some coordinatization of the space of ω^0 fields and also of the ξ fields; together these coordinatize the twistors according to (14). Whatever coordinatization of these we choose, we will have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(u) - \xi(u_0) &= (u - u_0 + \lambda(u, \gamma) - \lambda(u_0, \gamma)) \bar{\partial}\omega^0 + \\ &\quad \frac{\bar{\partial}\omega^0(\gamma)}{\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'}(\gamma)} (\bar{\partial}'\lambda(u, \gamma) - \bar{\partial}'\lambda(u_0, \gamma)) \bar{\omega}^{0'}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

by (14,15,16), and this will determine the transition functions. Since this has a well-defined limit (zero) as ω^0 is taken identically to zero, the transition functions extend to be C^0 there.

3.3 Structure of $\mathcal{T}$

We have just seen that $\mathcal{T}$ is a smooth manifold except where ω^0 vanishes identically, where it is of class C^0 . The transition functions respect the fibration over $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$, so the space $\mathcal{T}$ fibres over $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$. Each fibre has the structure of an affine complex two-plane, for the transition functions only act by translations. Each choice of cut provides a trivialization of the bundle, identifying $\mathcal{T}$ with $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$. There is a well-defined scaling action $(\omega^0, \omega^1, \pi_{0'}, \pi_{1'}) \mapsto k(\omega^0, \omega^1, \pi_{0'}, \pi_{1'})$.

We shall take as the infinity twistor $I(Z, \dot{Z}) = \dot{\omega}^0 \bar{\partial} \omega^0 - \omega^0 \bar{\partial} \dot{\omega}^0$ (which is constant over $\mathcal{J}^+$), in agreement with Penrose. There is a well-defined real function on $\mathcal{T}$ which naturally extends the definition of the (squared) norm, that is the quantity $\Phi = \omega^A \bar{\pi}_A + \pi_{A'} \bar{\omega}^{A'}$ evaluated at $\gamma(\omega^0)$ (and equal to zero if ω^0 vanishes identically). Even on a specific cut $\mathcal{S}$, where $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ has a complex-linear structure, the form Φ is *not* in general Hermitian, because the expression $\omega^A \bar{\pi}_A + \pi_{A'} \bar{\omega}^{A'}$ must be evaluated at the point $\gamma(\omega^0)$ depending on the twistor in question; this introduces a significant additional nonlinearity. In fact (as Penrose noted), the condition that this expression be constant over $\mathcal{S}$ is precisely that $\mathcal{S}$ be purely electric. Our function Φ thus reduces to a Hermitian one (and agrees with Penrose's) on a cut precisely if the cut is purely electric; otherwise it is a more complicated object.

This strongly nonlinear Φ has two advantages. First, it is independent of the choice of cut, and this means that we have a universal notion of real twistors, and thus a way of comparing angular momenta on different cuts of $\mathcal{J}^+$. Second, it provides a direct link to space-time geometry, for with this definition of Φ we may identify the real twistors with the null geodesics (together with their parallel-propagated tangent spinors) meeting $\mathcal{J}^+$, in the usual way. The function Φ does restrict to a Hermitian form on those twistors with the field ω^0 fixed up to proportionality, because in this case one does not need to vary $\gamma(\omega^0)$. If we fix also the scale of ω^0 (and require ω^0 not identically zero), then the set of all null twistors with this ω^0 field is evidently a real three-dimensional affine space. In the special-relativistic case, this space would be identified with Minkowski space modulo the translations by $\bar{\pi}^A \pi^{A'}$, where $\pi_{A'}$ stands for ω^0 regarded as an element of $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$. We thus get, for each $\pi_{A'} \neq 0$, a space which can be regarded as a space of origins modulo translations by multiples of $\bar{\pi}^A \pi^{A'}$. As we expect the component of the angular momentum in the direction $\pi_{A'}$ to be independent of such translations, we will have, for this component, as much of a well-defined space of origins as is necessary for the definition of angular momentum.

4 Kinematics on $\mathcal{T}$

As our construction allows us to identify $\mathcal{T}$ with Penrose's $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ on a cut $\mathcal{S}$, we may take over Penrose's definition of the kinematic twistor directly to $\mathcal{T}$,

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z) = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \{ \psi_1(\omega^0)^2 + 2(\psi_2 + \sigma \bar{\sigma}) \omega^0 \omega^1 \} d\mathcal{S}. \quad (18)$$

This defines the ‘unpolarized’ form, corresponding to the Minkowski quantity $A_{\alpha\beta}Z^\alpha Z^\beta$. A polarized form, corresponding to $A_{\alpha\beta}Z^\alpha \dot{Z}^\beta$, can also be defined. While these forms are quadratic and bilinear, respectively, as functions on $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$, one cannot say they have these properties as functions on $\mathcal{T}$, because of the lack of a linear structure on that space.

Even restricting our attention to one cut, however, the linear structure on $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ is in generic circumstances much less significant than it is in special relativity, for the special-relativistic formalism for angular momentum is recovered only when the shear is purely electric. If the shear is not purely electric, one cannot recover a suitable Minkowski space of origins with respect to which one might define angular momentum in familiar Poincaré terms. We are thus forced to confront, even on a single cut, a non-Poincaré character of the angular momentum: what does $A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z)$ mean?

Briefly, we may interpret $A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z)$, for real Z , as the $\pi_{A'}$ -component of the angular momentum about the geodesic defined by Z (or really about the point where Z meets $\mathcal{I}^+$, since the construction is really defined at $\mathcal{I}^+$). This interpretation is valid whether Z meets $\mathcal{I}^+$ in $\mathcal{S}$ or not, and whether Z , if it does meet $\mathcal{S}$, is a member of the congruence of null geodesics meeting $\mathcal{S}$ orthogonally. A fuller understanding will be developed by investigating the spin and center of mass.

4.1 Magnetic shears and spin

As noted above, when a magnetic component of the shear is present, the definition of the norm adopted here in general precludes the identification of a Minkowski space of origins. It is natural to ask what happens to the spin in this situation, for in special relativity the spin is origin-independent. Thus we may hope to get an origin-independent spin in general relativity. It is not at all obvious, however, that it is possible to do so. The most common special-relativistic approaches to spin have no obvious analogs here, because these approaches begin from the angular momentum evaluated at an origin. Remarkably, however, there is a suitable such definition. We saw in section 2.2 that in special relativity there is an expression for the spin in twistorial terms, and it turns out that the same expression results in an origin-independent definition of spin here. The definition is more complicated than in special relativity, though, in that the spin is not (if magnetic shear is present) purely vectorial ($j = 1$), but has higher- j components as well.

In order to derive it, let us begin by working out $A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z, \dot{Z})$ in some detail. For simplicity we take the time axis of the Bondi system aligned with the Bondi–Sachs energy–momentum, and assume that λ has no $j = 0$ or $j = 1$ parts with respect to this choice. Then substituting $\omega^1 = \omega^0 \bar{\partial} \lambda - \lambda \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \alpha \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \beta \bar{\omega}^{0'}$ (and similarly for $\dot{\omega}^1$), we find

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z, \dot{Z}) = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \Big\{ & [\psi_1 + 2(\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}}) \bar{\partial} \lambda + \bar{\partial}(\lambda(\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}}))] \omega^0 \dot{\omega}^0 \\ & + (\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}})(\alpha \dot{\omega}^0 \bar{\partial} \omega^0 + \dot{\alpha} \omega^0 \bar{\partial} \dot{\omega}^0) \\ & + (\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}})(\dot{\beta} \omega^0 \bar{\omega}^{0'} + \beta \dot{\omega}^0 \bar{\omega}^{0'}) \Big\} d\mathcal{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The middle term can be written as one proportional to $(\alpha + \acute{\alpha})\eth(\omega^0\acute{\omega}^0)$ (but this has pure $j = 1$ and so contributes nothing to the integral in our choice of frame) and one proportional to $(\alpha - \acute{\alpha})(\acute{\omega}^0\eth\omega^0 - \omega^0\eth\acute{\omega}^0) = (\alpha - \acute{\alpha})I_{\alpha\beta}Z^\alpha\acute{Z}^\beta$, which is constant over the cut. Letting $\pi_{A'}$ and $\acute{\pi}_{A'}$ denote the spinor fields ω^0 and $\acute{\omega}^0$, we may write in parallel to (4) and (5)

$$A_S(Z, \acute{Z}) = 2i\mu^{A'B'}\pi_{A'}\acute{\pi}_{B'} + (i/2)M(\alpha - \acute{\alpha})\epsilon^{R'S'}\pi_{R'}\acute{\pi}_{S'} + iP^{AA'}(\acute{\beta}\pi_{A'}\acute{\pi}_A + \beta\bar{\pi}_A\acute{\pi}_{A'}), \quad (20)$$

where the three terms correspond to the three lines of (19). (The notation here is conventional, but there is one point where it can be confusing. This is that the symbol $\pi_{A'}$ now stands for the spinor field ω^0 as an abstract element of $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$, and not for the spinor field $\pi_{1'O_{A'}} - \pi_{0'\iota_{A'}}$ representing components of the local twistor, as it did previously. From this point on, we shall only use $\pi_{A'}$ to stand for an element of $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$, and we shall write out the spinor field $\pi_{1'O_{A'}} - \pi_{0'\iota_{A'}}$ when we need it.)

The formula (7) for the spin requires certain restrictions on the twistors. First, we require Z and $\acute{Z}$ to be real. We have $\Phi(Z) = (\omega^0\bar{\pi}_0 + \omega^1\bar{\pi}_1 + \pi_{0'}\bar{\omega}^{0'} + \pi_{1'}\bar{\omega}^{1'})\Big|_\gamma = (-i\omega^1\eth'\bar{\omega}^{0'} + i\bar{\omega}^{1'}\eth\omega^0)\Big|_\gamma = i(\lambda - \alpha - \bar{\lambda} + \bar{\alpha})\eth\omega^0\eth'\bar{\omega}^{0'}\Big|_\gamma$. Thus Z is real iff $\alpha - \lambda(\gamma)$ is real. (And similarly $\acute{Z}$ is real iff $\acute{\alpha} - \lambda(\acute{\gamma})$ is real.)

The special-relativistic formula for the spin also requires $A_S(Z) = A_S(Z, Z) = 0$ and $A_S(\acute{Z}) = A_S(\acute{Z}, \acute{Z}) = 0$. The force of these conditions can be deduced from (20), however, by letting the twistors coincide. We find $\mu^{A'B'}\pi_{A'}\pi_{B'} + \beta P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'} = 0$, which we regard as an equation for β , and similarly for $\acute{\beta}$.

With these formulas in hand, it is straightforward to show that

$$\Re A_S(Z, \acute{Z})/I(Z, \acute{Z}) = (2P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'}P^{BB'}\acute{\pi}_B\acute{\pi}_{B'})^{-1} \cdot \left[(S_v^{AA'} + MP^{AA'}\Im\lambda(\gamma))\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'}P^{BB'}\acute{\pi}_B\acute{\pi}_{B'} - (S_v^{AA'} + MP^{AA'}\Im\lambda(\acute{\gamma}))\acute{\pi}_A\acute{\pi}_{A'}P^{BB'}\bar{\pi}_B\pi_{B'} \right], \quad (21)$$

where the freedom in $\alpha, \acute{\alpha}$ has canceled out and

$$S_v^{AA'} = 2\Re\mu^{A'B'}P^A_{B'} \quad (22)$$

is the usual formula for the Pauli–Lubański spin-vector. Remembering that in special relativity this is M times the spin, we may in our case define the spin by

$$\text{spin}(\pi_{A'}) = M^{-1}S_v^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'} + P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'}\Im\lambda(\gamma), \quad (23)$$

where γ is the generator of $\mathcal{J}^+$ corresponding to $\pi_{A'}$.

The vectorial part S_v^a is orthogonal to the time axis here. It is natural therefore to replace the null vector $\bar{\pi}^A\pi_{A'}$ by its spatial projection. The term $\lambda(\gamma)$ depends only on this projection as well. Thus with a slight abuse of notation, the spin in the unit $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ direction is

$$\text{spin}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = M^{-1}S_v^a\hat{\mathbf{r}}_a + M\Im\lambda(\hat{\mathbf{r}}). \quad (24)$$

The simplicity of this formula, and the clean connection of spin and magnetic shear it gives, have already been noted. That this formula should exist at all — that the quantity within square brackets in (21) should allow a separation of the terms in Z and $\dot{Z}$ — is also remarkable.

4.2 Mass-moments and center-of-mass

If P_a and $\mu^{A'B'}$ are the energy-momentum and angular momentum of a special-relativistic system, and P_a is timelike (which we will always assume), then we may write

$$\mu^{A'B'} = \left(k^{AA'} - iM^{-2}S^{AA'} \right) P_A{}^{B'}, \quad (25)$$

where M is the mass, and k^a , S^a , each orthogonal to P_a , represent the center of mass (in the plane $P_a x^a = 0$) and the Pauli-Lubański spin vector. Thus the center of mass and spin appear as the real and imaginary parts of a single quantity. In special relativity, in order to identify the center of mass of a system, one looks for points at which the vector k^a vanishes. If we wish to do this by examining $\mu^{A'B'}$, we must first subtract the spin contribution. We will follow the same strategy in general relativity.

In the general-relativistic case, we may again interpret a real twistor Z as a null geodesic γ together with a tangent spinor $\pi_{A'}$, and we may interpret $(2i)^{-1}A_S(Z)$ as the $\pi_{A'}$ -component of the angular momentum about γ . (This γ is then not the same as the generator $\gamma(\omega^0)$, but γ does meet $\mathcal{I}^+$ at $\gamma(\omega^0)$.) The natural way to subtract the spin component of the angular momentum is to form

$$\begin{aligned} (2i)^{-1}A_S(Z) + iM^{-1}P_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\pi}_A}\text{spin} &= \left(\mu^{A'B'} + iM^{-2}S_v^{AA'}P_A{}^{B'} \right) \pi_{A'}\pi_{B'} \\ &+ \beta P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'} + iM^{-1}P_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\pi}_A}P^{BB'}\bar{\pi}_B\pi_{B'}\Im\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The operator $M^{-1}P_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}\partial/\partial\bar{\pi}_A$ figuring here is essentially the $\bar{\partial}'$ operator acting on functions of $\bar{\pi}_A$, but this notation will be avoided here, because, while it is ‘morally the same’ as the $\bar{\partial}'$ operator appearing elsewhere in this paper, they differ by a factor, as will now be shown. (Note that this operator passes through $P^{BB'}\bar{\pi}_B\pi_{B'}$.)

We are using the symbol $\pi_{A'}$ to represent the field ω^0 , thought of as an element of $\mathbb{S}_{A'}$. Remembering that we have chosen the time-axis of the Bondi system aligned with the Bondi energy-momentum, we have $P_a = Mt_a$ (where t^a is the unit timelike vector determining the frame), and thus, by basic spin-coefficient results, we have $t_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}$ corresponding to $\bar{\partial}\omega^0$, and so we must differentiate $\Im\lambda$ by perturbing $\bar{\omega}^{0'}$ by $\bar{\partial}\omega^0$. However, the potential $\Im\lambda$ is given, not as a function of ω^0 (or $\bar{\omega}^{0'}$), but as a function of γ , the generator on which ω^0 vanishes. Perturbing the defining equation $\omega^0(\gamma) = 0$, we find

$$-(\delta\gamma_a)m^a\bar{\partial}'\omega^0 - (\delta\gamma_a)\bar{m}^a\bar{\partial}\omega^0 + \delta\omega^0 = 0, \quad (27)$$

where $\delta\gamma^a$ is the infinitesimal perturbation of γ as $\bar{\omega}^{0'}$ is perturbed by $\delta\bar{\omega}^{0'} = \bar{\partial}\omega^0$. However, we have $\bar{\partial}'\omega^0 = 0$, and so $\delta\gamma_a\bar{m}^a\bar{\partial}\omega^0 = \delta\omega^0$. Applying this to our perturbation $\delta\bar{\omega}^{0'} = \bar{\partial}\omega^0$, we have $\delta\gamma_a m^a = \bar{\partial}\omega^0/\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'}$. Therefore $t_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda/\partial\bar{\pi}_A = -(\bar{\partial}\omega^0/\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'})\bar{\partial}'\bar{\partial}\lambda$ and

$$(2i)^{-1}A_S(Z) + iM^{-1}P_A{}^{A'}\pi_{A'}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\pi}_A}\text{spin} = \left(\mu^{A'B'} + iM^{-2}S_v^{AA'}P_A{}^{B'}\right)\pi_{A'}\pi_{B'} \\ + \beta P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'} - iP^{BB'}\bar{\pi}_B\pi_{B'}(\bar{\partial}\omega^0/\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'})\bar{\partial}'\bar{\partial}\lambda. \quad (28)$$

This quantity should be interpreted as the $\pi_{A'}$ -component of the mass-moment of the system at the geodesic γ .

The center of mass is given by the vanishing of the mass-moments, and so by the vanishing of (28). The vanishing of this equation gives us a formula for β in terms of $\pi_{A'}$, or, equivalently, in terms of the generator of $\mathcal{J}^+$. Thus for any generator of $\mathcal{J}^+$ we get a spinor $\pi_{A'}$, and this spinor determines β from the vanishing of (28). This choice of β , together with an admissible choice of α (recall we must have $\alpha - \lambda(\gamma)$ real for Z to be a real twistor) determines a twistor from (14).

In these formulas, the twistor Z is one meeting $\mathcal{J}^+$ in the generator labeled by $\pi_{A'}$ (or equivalently, determined by the vanishing of ω^0). The freedom in choosing α simply corresponds to translating the twistor up or down the generator (as follows from (15)), and is here not very significant, as the time axis is chosen to coincide with the Bondi–Sachs energy–momentum and this means the entire system is invariant under such time translations. The freedom in β is more interesting, and varying β corresponds to making different choices of real twistor (that is, of null geodesic), through the same point of $\mathcal{J}^+$, the complex parameter β representing the two real degrees of freedom in this choice. Thus a determination of β by the vanishing of (28) is precisely a selection of a null geodesic inwards from the point of $\mathcal{J}^+$ in question, this geodesic being interpretable as the one, through that point, directed towards the center of mass of system.

The family of such geodesics determines a congruence which has an intuitive geometric significance: it is the congruence one would obtain by supertranslating the Bondi system to remove the electric part of the shear (as measured at $\mathcal{S}$). To see this, we examine the tangent spinor to the congruence, which is (not the abstract $\pi_{A'} \in \mathbb{S}_{A'}$ but) the field $\pi_{1'}o_{A'} - \pi_{0'}\iota_{A'}$, evaluated at γ :

$$i(\bar{\partial}\omega^0)o_{A'} - i(\bar{\partial}'\omega^1)\iota_{A'} = i(\bar{\partial}\omega^0)o_{A'} - i(-\bar{\partial}'\lambda\bar{\partial}\omega^0 + \beta\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'})\iota_{A'} \\ = i\bar{\partial}\omega^0\left(o_{A'} + \left(\bar{\partial}'\lambda - \frac{\bar{\partial}'\bar{\omega}^{0'}}{\bar{\partial}\omega^0}\beta\right)\iota_{A'}\right). \quad (29)$$

Comparing this with the vanishing of (28), we see that β is chosen precisely to remove the contribution of the imaginary part of λ , leaving only the real part, which is the angular potential for the electric part of the shear.

This result seems very reasonable. In the first place, it would have the effect of removing any shear which was purely gauge — that is, arose entirely from a supertranslation. In the second place, that the magnetic portion of the

shear has canceled out means that the congruence meets $\mathcal{J}^+$ orthogonally in a well-defined family of cuts (given by supertranslations by $\Re\lambda$). These may be interpreted as instants of retarded time in the rest-frame of the system, as defined instantaneously at $\mathcal{S}$.

The results here and in the previous subsection have an overall parallelism despite a considerable difference in detail. The spin and the center of mass are very different sorts of quantities in general relativity, with the spin simply a direction-dependent function, but the center of mass a null congruence. Yet the magnetic part of the shear is essentially the $j \geq 2$ part of the spin, and the electric part of the shear is essentially the $j \geq 2$ part of the center of mass. Thus one may say that the shear itself codes the $j \geq 2$ part of the angular momentum.

4.3 Flux

It is straightforward to compute the evolution of the angular momentum; one simply uses the formula (19) for the kinematic twistor together with the formulas (14,15,16) for the twistors and their evolution. (Such a direct approach is possible precisely because the angular momentum is defined on a space $\mathcal{T}$ which is independent of the cut.) We shall only compute the evolution in retarded time for a fixed Bondi system, for simplicity, although this paper's approach would allow the computation between two arbitrary cuts.

We have

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}(Z, \dot{Z}) = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \{ \psi_1 \omega^0 \dot{\omega}^0 + (\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}})(\omega^0 \dot{\omega}^1 + \dot{\omega}^0 \omega^1) \} d\mathcal{S}. \quad (30)$$

Differentiating this, and using the relations

$$\dot{\psi}_1 = \bar{\partial}\psi_2 + 2\sigma\psi_3 - 8\pi GT_{(01)1'1'}, \quad (31)$$

$$\dot{\psi}_2 = \bar{\partial}\psi_3 + \sigma\psi_4 - 4\pi GT_{111'1'}, \quad (32)$$

we find, after a little work,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u} A(Z, \dot{Z}) = \mathcal{F}_{\text{matter}} + \mathcal{F}_{\text{Bondi}} + \mathcal{F}_{\text{shift}}, \quad (33)$$

where the three terms on the right will be discussed separately.

The first term in (33),

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{matter}} = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \{ -8\pi GT_{(01)1'1'} \omega^0 \dot{\omega}^0 - 4\pi GT_{111'1'} [\omega^0 \dot{\omega}^1 + \dot{\omega}^0 \omega^1] \} d\mathcal{S}, \quad (34)$$

is the flux of energy-momentum and angular momentum carried away by matter. This term is exactly what one would expect on formal grounds.

The second term in (33),

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{Bondi}} = \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \{ [\psi_2 + \sigma \dot{\bar{\sigma}}] [2\omega^0 \dot{\omega}^0 \bar{\partial}\dot{\lambda} - \dot{\lambda} \bar{\partial}(\omega^0 \dot{\omega}^0)] + \dot{\sigma} \dot{\bar{\sigma}} [\omega^0 \dot{\omega}^1 + \dot{\omega}^0 \omega^1] \} d\mathcal{S}, \quad (35)$$

is a generalization of the Bondi energy-loss term. It is $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ -linear. Its contribution to the energy-momentum is through the term $\dot{\sigma}\dot{\bar{\sigma}}[\omega^0\dot{\omega}^1 + \dot{\omega}^0\omega^1]$, and this is exactly what one expects and is second-order in the gravitational radiation. Its contribution to the angular momentum is through the term $[\psi_2 + \sigma\dot{\bar{\sigma}}][2\omega^0\dot{\omega}^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}\dot{\lambda} - \dot{\lambda}\dot{\bar{\sigma}}(\omega^0\dot{\omega}^0)]$ (and energy-momentum parts can mix in as well, of course, because of the origin-dependence). This portion will in general have contributions which are *first-order* in the gravitational radiation, since $\dot{\lambda}$ is first-order. What is necessary for such first-order contributions is that the angular dependences of $\dot{\lambda}$ and the mass aspect $[\psi_2 + \sigma\dot{\bar{\sigma}}]$ should combine to produce $j = 0$ or $j = 1$ terms. This means that the angular dependence of the gravitational radiation should be suitably correlated with the anisotropy of the system.

The final term in (33),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_{\text{shift}} &= \frac{-i}{4\pi G} \oint \left\{ [\psi_2 + \sigma\dot{\bar{\sigma}}][\dot{\lambda}(\gamma)\omega^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}\dot{\omega}^0 + \dot{\lambda}(\gamma)\dot{\omega}^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}\omega^0 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\dot{\bar{\sigma}}\omega^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}'\dot{\lambda}/\dot{\bar{\sigma}}'\dot{\omega}^{0'})\Big|_{\dot{\gamma}}\omega^0\dot{\bar{\omega}}^{0'} + (\dot{\bar{\sigma}}\omega^0\dot{\bar{\sigma}}'\dot{\lambda}/\dot{\bar{\sigma}}'\dot{\omega}^{0'})\Big|_{\dot{\gamma}}\dot{\omega}^0\dot{\bar{\omega}}^{0'} \right\} d\mathcal{S} \\ &= (-i/2)M \left(\dot{\lambda}(\gamma) - \dot{\lambda}(\gamma) \right) \epsilon^{A'B'} \dot{\pi}_{A'}\pi_{B'} \\ &\quad + i\dot{\pi}_{A'}t_A^{A'} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{\pi}_A} \dot{\lambda}(\gamma) P^{AA'} \dot{\pi}_A \pi_{A'} + i\pi_{A'}t_A^{A'} \frac{\partial}{\partial \dot{\pi}_A} \dot{\lambda}(\gamma) P^{AA'} \dot{\pi}_A \dot{\pi}_{A'} \quad (36)\end{aligned}$$

(where the simplifications in the last step make use of the results of the preceding subsection), contains the terms reflecting the shift in linear structure on $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S})$ as $\mathcal{S}$ is evolved. These terms are in general first-order in the radiation. Note that this term is *not* origin-dependent: it depends only on the ω^0 , $\dot{\omega}^0$ parts of the twistors, not on ω^1 , $\dot{\omega}^1$. Thus these ‘shift’ contributions to the flux only displace one fibre of $\mathcal{T}$ relative to another; they do not alter the affine structure within each fibre which codes the origin-dependence.

It is of some interest to compare the last formula for $\mathcal{F}_{\text{shift}}$ with our earlier formula (6) for the special-relativistic kinematic twistor: we had

$$A(Z, \dot{Z}) = 2i\mu^{A'B'}(x_{\text{av}})\pi_{A'}\dot{\pi}_{B'} - (i/2)P_a x_{\text{diff}}^a \pi_{B'}\dot{\pi}^{B'}, \quad (37)$$

where $x_{\text{av}}^a = (x^a + \dot{x}^a)/2$, $x_{\text{diff}}^a = x^a - \dot{x}^a$, and x^a , $\dot{x}^a$ were any two points in Minkowski space on the real twistors Z , $\dot{Z}$. The general-relativistic formula for the flux has a parallel structure, with $M(\dot{\lambda}(\gamma) - \dot{\lambda}(\gamma))\epsilon^{A'B'}\dot{\pi}_{A'}\pi_{B'}$ corresponding to the term involving x_{diff}^a , and the other terms in (36) to an average of the ‘shift’ contributions to the flux of angular momentum at the two points.

4.4 Nearly stationary systems

It is worthwhile examining the evolution of the angular momentum in the case of nearly stationary systems, partly because these account for a class of substantial interest, and partly in order to clarify some of the ideas involved.

We must first make precise what we mean by a nearly stationary system. Since we are interested in the asymptotic behavior of the field only, what we have in mind is a system which departs from stationarity only to first order near $\mathcal{I}^+$. (The system may have a strong time-dependence in the interior of space-time.)

We take the Bondi system to be aligned with the (approximate) stationarity, so that $\psi_2 = -M$ to zeroth order, where M is the mass. We assume as well that the Bondi frame has been chosen so that the shear itself (and not just its u -derivative) is a first-order quantity. It is no loss in generality to assume that λ is chosen to have only $j \geq 2$ components, as before. And we shall assume, for simplicity, no matter fields are present near infinity. Then the flux $\mathcal{F}_{\text{matter}}$ due to matter vanishes.

The Bondi flux term $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Bondi}}$ also vanishes. First, the terms proportional to $\dot{\sigma}\bar{\sigma}$ and $\sigma\bar{\sigma}$ are second-order, and so will be neglected here. This leaves only the terms proportional to ψ_2 . However, for the particular spherical harmonics considered here, these must vanish, because the only first-order terms represent products of M (pure $j = 0$) with $\dot{\lambda}$ (only $j \geq 2$) and $\omega^0\bar{\omega}^0$ (only $j = 0, j = 1$).

We are left with only the ‘shift’ flux term $\mathcal{F}_{\text{shift}}$. The $\pi_{A'}$ -component of the total emitted angular momentum will be

$$\begin{aligned} -(2i)^{-1}\Delta A(Z) &= -(2i)^{-1}\int_{u_0}^{u_1}\mathcal{F}_{\text{shift}}\Big|_{Z=\dot{Z}}du \\ &= -P^{AA'}\bar{\pi}_A\pi_{A'}\pi_{A'}t_A{}^{A'}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\pi}_A}\Delta\lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Comparing this with the discussions of the center of mass and spin in the preceding subsections, we see that *if a system departs only to first order from stationarity near $\mathcal{I}^+$, then the energy-momentum and the $j = 1$ parts of the angular momentum are unchanged*, but the $j \geq 2$ parts of the angular momentum change with the shear, the electric and magnetic parts of the shear contributing to the change in center of mass and spin, respectively. This implies that *if in addition the system is stationary initially and finally, then the change in angular momentum is a pure $j \geq 2$ change in the center of mass, with no change in the spin*, because the magnetic component of the shear vanishes in any stationary regime.

5 Linearized theory and special relativity

In this section, I discuss some elements of the linearized (that is, post-Minkowskian) theory. Of course, this linearized theory would be adequate for many physical situations. But there is another reason for treating it, an important conceptual one going to the liaison between special and general relativity, and that is the main concern here.

In fact, we seem to be confronted with a paradox. We have been forced by general relativity to introduce a concept of angular momentum with an entirely new character, a non-Poincaré dependence on the component being measured. On one hand, one can understand that general relativity, whose

asymptotic symmetry group is not the Poincaré group, might lead to such a structure. But (on the other) it seems that this new, non-Poincaré, angular momentum is something which never could be exchanged with non-gravitational systems, since *their* angular momenta *are* Poincaré-covariant! If this really were the case, the definition put forward here of general-relativistic angular momentum would be very questionable.

However, this paradox is only apparent. While it is true that *strictly* special-relativistic angular momenta do not have the non-Poincaré character discovered here, we shall see that *as soon as even linearized generic gravitational effects are considered, consistency requires the use of the non-Poincaré angular momenta*. Thus as soon as one admits any sorts of general-relativistic corrections one is forced to non-Poincaré angular momenta. We shall see that the consistent application of these ideas, far from causing paradoxes, resolves a conundrum that had existed.

The situation might be compared to the transition from classical to quantum mechanics. In classical mechanics, the angular momentum is a c-number which has a definite value at any time. However, as soon as one treats an angular momentum quantum-mechanically, one is forced to an entirely new sort of object, an operator. And as soon as one angular momentum is treated quantum-mechanically, one must in general (unless special simplifications apply) treat all angular momenta which couple to it quantum-mechanically.

5.1 Two sorts of linearization

There are in fact two different sorts of linearization one might speak of, and it will be important to distinguish them. In each case, the gravitational field is treated as a perturbation of Minkowski space. However, in one case the twistors are simply taken to be those of Minkowski space, whereas in the other the twistors are also perturbed to first order. Roughly speaking, the first case corresponds to treating gravity as a helicity-two field on Minkowski space, whereas the second corresponds to the linearization of the full, nonlinear theory of angular momentum. It is the second case which is relevant here.

5.2 First-order corrections to special relativity

Let us consider a system with no incoming gravitational radiation. If T_{ab} represents the linearized stress-energy tensor, then the retarded solution to the linearized Einstein equation has

$$\psi_4 = -2^{3/2} G \bar{m}^b \bar{m}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} \int \delta(l_a(ut^a - y^a)) T_{bd}(y) d^4 y. \quad (39)$$

Since $\psi_4 = -\ddot{\bar{\sigma}}$, we expect, then,

$$\bar{\sigma} = 2^{3/2} G \bar{m}^b \bar{m}^d \int \delta(l_a(ut^a - y^a)) T_{bd}(y) d^4 y. \quad (40)$$

(This is not quite obvious, because of the integrations involved, but it can be verified by direct calculations.) Thus the presence of matter generates shear at $\mathcal{I}^+$, and in general this shear evolves.

As an illustration, consider perhaps the simplest case, the scattering of particles due to contact forces. Then (40) gives the contribution of a particle with mass μ to $\bar{\sigma}$ as $2^{3/2}G\mu(\bar{m}_a\dot{\gamma}^a)^2/(l_b\dot{\gamma}^b)$, where $\dot{\gamma}^a$ is the four-velocity of the particle. Thus the shear is determined by the velocities of the particles and their masses. If we consider the case of particles which scatter off each other by contact, the shears before and after are in general different. Thus *even for very simple interactions, the first-order general-relativistic correction will result in a net change in shear in a scattering process.* This will result in non-Poincaré contributions to the angular momentum.

5.3 Resolving a difficulty

The treatment of angular momentum given here resolves a conundrum having to do with the extension of angular momentum to linearized gravity.

Suppose we try to extend the special-relativistic treatment of momentum and angular momentum to take into account first-order gravitational effects. We must then deal with the fact that in general (except for very simple systems with no interactions), the first-order corrections to a special-relativistic system will result in the emission of gravitational waves, and also changes in the shear. This change in the shear breaks the Poincaré symmetry at $\mathcal{I}^+$ and introduces a first-order ambiguity in the selection of a Poincaré subgroup of the BMS group and hence in the definition of angular momentum.

It is at this point that attempts to incorporate first-order general-relativistic corrections to theories of angular momentum run into difficulties. The ambiguity in the choice of Poincaré subgroup leads to all the familiar difficulties with defining angular momentum in the full theory (although at a linearized level). In other words, taking into account general relativity to first order, the angular momenta of several billiard balls before and after a collision are not related by a Poincaré motion, because the gravitational waves emitted in the collision distort the geometry of space-time after the collision relative to that before it. (Of course, the error in neglecting this is very small, amounting to a positional ambiguity $\sim GM\Delta v^2/c^4 \sim 10^{-42}$ cm!)

The present treatment resolves this difficulty, for the angular momentum is defined twistorially and the shift in shear is accommodated. We see that a conventional mechanical system would be expected to emit small amounts of gravitational radiation, and that radiation would give a small non-Poincaré correction to the angular momentum. It is only when we completely neglect general-relativistic effects, and model the system special-relativistically, that the usual Poincaré structure is really recovered.

6 Number of independent constants of motion

In special relativity, the angular momentum comprises six independent constants of motion (assuming the energy-momentum is given). The definition

given here of angular momentum in general relativity seems to comprise *infinitely many* constants of motion, because it consists of apparently independent contributions for each $j \geq 1$. Have we in fact found that somehow general relativity, which one would expect to have *fewer* symmetries than special relativity, really has infinitely many *more* constants of motion?

Surprisingly, there is an important sense in which the answer to this question is Yes. However, the situation requires some discussion.

First, we are not considering absolute constants of motion (those, in fact, would be less interesting to us), because we wish to treat a system from which material and gravitational radiation may be escaping. One should in fact think of a choice of cut as partitioning the system into two portions, an interior one (determined by data on a partial Cauchy surface meeting the cut), and the portion of $\mathcal{J}^+$ to the past of the cut. We are also especially interested in those constants of motion which can be computed from fields on the cut, for physically of course those represent data accessible asymptotically at a particular retarded time.

Second, for the systems we consider, there are infinitely many constants of motion (for general relativity is a field theory). Of all these constants of motion, the most natural and interesting for the radiative modes are those forming the shear at a cut. (So there is a sphere's worth of constants of motion, being the values of the shear at the different generators.) These are locally measurable at the cut, and they are physically interesting also as the time-integrals of the wave profiles.

If we count the number of constants of motion, we have six for the $j = 1$, 'conventional', angular momenta, and $2(2j + 1)$ for the $j \geq 2$ degrees of freedom in the shear. What is new is really not the degrees of freedom in the shear, but our *interpretation* of these as representing angular momenta.

That said, how is it that we have acquired infinitely many more constants of motion than there were in special relativity? The answer is that we have taken into account the gravitational degrees of freedom, and the coupling between gravity in matter, and these are neglected in special relativity, and so we now have available to us infinitely many degrees of freedom, and constants of motion, which were not contemplated in special relativity.

Suppose, for example, we considered some system in special relativity, and computed the integral (40) that we know, from linearized general relativity, would lead to the shear. In special relativity we would not call this a constant of motion, and we would have no particular reason to be interested in it. However, in linearized gravity it gives us the shear, and we interpret its change over time as giving us information about the gravitational radiation. It is the fact that we keep track of this gravitational radiation, with its functional degrees of freedom, which makes the difference: the change in shear is accounted for as a transfer of a quantity of these constants of motion from the internal portion of the space-time to the emitted gravitational radiation.

In short, the count of constants of motion comes out as expected; it is rather the unification of the concepts of shear and angular momentum which is new.

7 Conclusions

The main conclusion of this paper is that it is possible to treat the angular momentum of an isolated gravitational system by introducing a suitable twistor space. This space is naturally defined in terms of the universal structure of null infinity $\mathcal{J}^+$. It lacks the full linear structure special-relativistic twistor space has, but it does possess a fiber-bundle structure. The base space in question is the space of spinors at infinity, or, essentially equivalently, the space of generators of $\mathcal{J}^+$.

The nonlinearities as we pass from one fibre to another in twistor space become, in space–time terms, angular dependences for the angular momentum which are more complex than the essentially vectorial ($j = 1$) behavior in special relativity. The two parts of the relativistic angular momentum, the spin and the center of mass, both have angular dependences including terms for all $j \geq 1$. The terms for $j \geq 2$ are precisely due to the shear, the electric part of the shear determining the $j \geq 2$ parts of the center of mass and the magnetic part of the shear determining the $j \geq 2$ parts of the spin. Additionally, the center of mass has a direct physical interpretation as a null congruence inwards from $\mathcal{J}^+$, which one thinks of as directed towards the center of the system.

Angular momentum, unlike energy–momentum, can be emitted at *first order* by gravitational waves, and this applies even to the ‘conventional’ ($j = 1$) parts. However, such first-order emission does require a correlation between the anisotropy of the waves and of the mass-aspect of the system, and this is not expected for systems departing only to first order from stationarity. For nearly stationary systems, angular momentum can be emitted by first-order gravitational radiation, but it has a purely $j \geq 2$ character.

The appearance of higher- j terms in the angular momentum is due to the fact that it becomes appropriate and natural to identify data for the gravitational radiation (the shear) with some angular momenta. This radiation field has infinitely many conserved quantities (although not absolutely conserved), given precisely by the values of the shear, and so the theory of angular momentum is now a theory of infinitely many such quantities.

References

1. Geroch, R., Winicour, J.: J. Math. Phys. **22**, 803 (1981).
2. Ko, M., Ludvigsen, M., Newman, E. T., Tod, K. P.: Phys. Repts. **71**, 51 (1981).
3. Newman, E. T., Penrose, R.: J. Math Phys. **7**, 863 (1966).
4. Penrose, R.: Gen. Rel. Grav. **7**, 31 (1976).
5. Penrose, R.: Proc. R. Soc. Lond. **A381**, 53 (1982).
6. Penrose, R., Rindler, W.: Spinors and space–time, University Press, Cambridge (1984–6).
7. Szabados, L.: Liv. Rev. Rel. **7**, 4 (2004). URL (cited on <7 February 2007>): <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-4>